MEETING MINUTES – June 13, 2001
FORMER LAKE ONTARIO ORDNANCE WORKS SITE (LOOW)
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

To: Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Members and Interested Parties

From: Mary Kay Foley, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Project Manager

SUBJECT: Minutes of the June 13, 2001 RAB Meeting

RAB Members Present:	**Affiliation:**
William Roger Angus	Community Member
Mike Basile	USEPA
Jennifer Rhue for Thomas Freck	Community Member
Tim Henderson	ROLE/Community Member
Martin Hodgins	Community Member
Kent Johnson	NYS Department of Environmental Conservation
Charles Lamb	Town of Porter
Darwin James Langlois	Town of Lewiston
Edward Lilly	Community Member
Nona McQuay	Community Member
Joseph Passanese for Clyde Johnston, Jr	Community Member
Neil Patterson, Jr.	Community Member
Daniel Serrianni, Jr.	Community Member
Gary Smith	Modern Landfill
John Syms	Somerset Group
Jim Weld	Community Member
Stephen Yaksich, Government Co-Chair	US Army Corps of Engineers, Buffalo District
Rebecca Zayatz	Chemical Waste Management, Inc.
RAB Members Absent:	
Sister Karen Allen	Community Member
Paul Dicky	Niagara County Health Department
Dr. Nils Olsen, Jr., Community Co-Chair	Community Member
Dr. Walter Polka	Community Member

Introduction and Welcome - Called Meeting to Order at 7:05 P.M. by Ms. Arleen Kreusch

- Administrative announcements:
  (1) Coordinator called attention to the fact that there was a full agenda for the meeting.
  (2) And due to the full agenda, RAB member questions are to be answered at the end of each presentation.
  (3) Public/community questions will be answered at the end of the evening. The public was reminded of receiving blue question sheets when they signed in. The public was asked to write down their questions throughout the evening just in case there was not enough time at the end for a question and answer period. All questions written on the blue sheets and turned in will receive an answer in the minutes that will be mailed to everyone that signed in.
  (4) Public/community members are reminded that when we get to the question and answer period to identify themselves before stating their question(s).
- The meeting was called to order and began by having the RAB members introduce themselves.
- The minutes from the last meeting were approved.
- Action Items from the last meeting were reviewed.

Agenda for June 13, 2001 meeting:

7:00	Introduction and Welcome/Call to Order Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes Review of Action Items	Arleen Kreusch, USACE (CT)
7:10	Corps Update	
	- Lake Ontario Ordnance Works Site RAB Member Question & Answer Period	Mary Kay Foley/ Sandy Staigerwald, EA Engineering
	- Niagara Falls Storage Site RAB Member Question & Answer Period	Judith Leithner
	- University of Rochester Burial Area RAB Member Question & Answer Period	Kent Johnson, NYSDEC
8:10	Technical Outreach Services to Communities RAB Member Question & Answer Period	William Librizzi, EPA
8:35	Election of Community Co-Chair and Alternate	Arleen Kreusch, USACE (CT)
8:45	Establish Action Items/Set Agenda & Date for Next RAB Meeting	RAB/Co-Chairs
8:50	Public Question and Answer Period	
9:00	Adjourn	

Slide Presentation – Buffalo District Corps of Engineers provided an overview of the Phase II Remedial Investigation (RI) data summary associated with the DERP-FUDS Program at the former Lake Ontario Ordnance Works Site. Presentation was made by Ms. Sandra Staigerwald, Project Scientist, EA Engineering (copies of briefing charts were provided at sign-in table).

ACTION ITEMS:

LOOW

Corps will present data	Will be addressing in briefing
Corps will look into providing RAB with technical assistance	Technical Outreach Services to Communities will be presenting tonight
Corps to provide status of buildings at LOOW Site	Corps has evaluated the deed between the Town of Lewiston and the government Buildings have been inventoried, a report will be issued this summer. Will remain an action item

NFSS

Corps to interview people who worked at the site between 1940 and 1986	Interviews ongoing
Corps will contact University of Rochester in	In progress

regards to obtaining documents associated with the Rochester Burial Area	
Corps to present data	Presentation planned for next meeting
General Action Items	
Niagara County Health Department to present information on future health studies	Will remain an action item
Tim Henderson will bring in documents regarding the west ditch of Six Mile Creek	Tim brought documents…Corps will copy them and return
Corps to develop environmental glossary	Action closed

A summary of RAB member questions and responses are presented in the tables below.

Questions and Answers from Restoration Advisory Board Members
Regarding the former Lake Ontario Ordnance Works Site

COMMENT	RESPONSE
Unidentified RAB Member: One small question, going west from the town of Lewiston, the lines show that no sampling whatsoever has been done there? It's not shown on the map then? Did any of it encompass the Lewiston-Porter groundwater? Thank you.	**Ms. Sandra Staigerwald**: No, there has been. It is not shown on this map because we were trying to focus on those areas that were more heavily investigated. …You mean the Lewiston-Porter Schools? Yes, samples were collected on Lewiston-Porter School. And actually we a slide further in the presentation that goes into that. Sure.
Unidentified RAB member: One little question, on areas 4, 7, 8 and 11, you have a little purple dot that appears only in that one site…that say VOC metals. Then you have the word sump…what do you mean sump…	**Staigerwald:** Right… Yes, there was one there…One of the things we noticed…was we collected samples all over as you can see from some of those previous slides. The areas that we targeted in particular, were some sumps…there were some drains on concrete pads that contained a little bit of sediment. There was vaults, sub-surface vaults that went down seven (7) feet that contained some sediment. So those were surface features that we targeted as part of the RI. And in fact, that is where a lot of out exceedences were reported…were in those sediment samples that were collected from those sumps, vaults and drainages.

Questions and Answers from Restoration Advisory Board Members
Regarding the Former Lake Ontario Ordnance Works Site (Continued)

COMMENT	RESPONSE
Unidentified RAB Member: How deep did you go?	**Staigerwald:** We have some drawings that indicate the depth of the line…actually the town of Lewiston has those drawings too because they use that line now. So we collected from just below the bottom of the pipeline. So what we were trying to do…so if anything has leaked from it, we wanted to target that soil.
	Staigerwald: Another area that was investigated…actually on the Occidental property…one of the RAB members suggested that he had seen a ground scar in one of the areas but it actually turned out to be a pond. And we investigated a pond...which we got results back for but we also investigated another area that turned out to be or looked like a storage area or a ground scar. We just got results back from that…and that's why we don't have any slides prepared...so excuse us for that, but we got the data yesterday. The area is located on Occidental Chemical property, which is…I don't know if you are familiar with Longs Walleye Hatchery. That area is west of Chemical Waste Management, south of Balmer Road. Okay the area was located in that portion…and the results did indicate that volatile organic compounds (VOC's) and semi-volatile organic compounds (SVOC's)….pesticides, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB's) did not exceed screening criteria, however, explosives were reported in some of the surface soil samples. There were ten locations that were sampled and three of those reported explosives. So we'd rather tell you about the results…even though we don't have nice slides to represent this. The property owner has been contacted, the walleye hatchery people have been contacted…so the information is out there and we'd rather present you with at least a verbal of what we found rather than you'll have to read about it in the news one day. One thing that I will note…just to alleviate concern is that when we say explosives, one thing I do want to mention is that none of those reported explosives were in concentrations that would be detonable. And I think there was a fact sheet (available for public pick-up on table), yes, that actually explains the concentrations and when it can be detonated and what concentration level can be detonated. And these concentrations were not indicative of something that would actually explode.

[**unidentified male audience member**] Q: Do you have a timeline for the future?	**Staigerwald:** Yes, and unfortunately I can't answer that question, and I would have to defer you to the project manager for the site (LOOW). **Mary Kay Foley**, LOOW Project Manager, USACOE: Yes, we do have a comprehensive plan of what needs to be done to clean up the site. However, our biggest limitation is funding and the speed at which we could clean things up are highly dependant upon how much funding we get.
Mr. Martin Hodgins Q: If you look on page…18 it kind of sticks in my mind a little bit. It has to do with the sampling of bore test, you when you do your sampling. I have two questions, one, and actually two questions with a statement. First question is…there ever any evidence that in the last 40-50 years that they did any deep well injection disposal. This is very common in the industrial ages during the [19]30's and [19]40s and [19]50s they would drill down about 50…60 feet on their site and just pour in everything they could imagine down that hole. And I know it was done in Niagara County on various industrial sites and what I heard tonight, just to stay with the first question. Is what we all heard tonight is that are a lot of different areas outside of the property or even in the property where we're finding chemicals that you wouldn't even think were there are there. So my question is, when you look at page 18, if you were to drill anything below 22 feet…10 feet you are only in the silt and clay. 1) I was just curious if there was any evidence that were was drilling done like the industrial people did in the county for years on these sites and #2 how deep did you drill…did you stay between 8 and 10 or did you go beyond 10 to 12? **[Hodgins]** Yes, exactly for example like the trash pit or the {inaudible words}	**Staigerwald:** [rephrased Mr. Hodgins' questions for audience]…did everybody hear his questions? Basically his question was did we have any evidence to suggest that some of the DoD activities involved drilling any deep wells to inject waste, is that basically what your questions was? **Staigerwald:** Right, and then your second question is like how deep did we go when we collected our samples. To answer your first question, we don't have any indication that they actually drilled very deep to dispose of this…our historical review as well as some of the sampling that has been done thus far indicate that what they did is they dug trenches. They dug up to eight feet deep...maybe a little deeper or maybe a little shallower and then just dumped truck loads full of whatever in to these. Some of the areas we saw that were disposal areas were actually bermed above. So they probably trenched down a little bit and bermed above to increase the… area and right, then disposed of it. We don't have any indication that they actually drilled down…past that clay to dispose of anything. Our sampling…targeted that silt and clay and then went down to that tight clay. Samples varied anywhere from…you know, surface sample down to

	twenty feet.
[Hodgins] You said you drilled down to twenty feet?	**Staigerwald:** Yes, on some locations that's correct.
[Hodgins] Did you ever go into the twenty-three foot area? You know where the silt and sand is? Thank you.	**Staigerwald:** No, we did not…what we did is drill down to the top of that tight clay and the tight clay varied in depth across the site. We did not drill into that silt sand. Now there were some previous investigations where they actually set some monitoring wells in that silt sand. So… Sure.
Mr. Timothy Henderson, Residents Organized for Lewiston-Porter's Environment (ROLE) Q: You mentioned that there were some elevated readings of lead in the core samples in the school area. Do you have any plans for further investigation of that…I mean is this in an area where the kids are playing?	**Staigerwald:** The area is actually just a little bit northeast of here by about 200 feet maybe even a little bit less. The data and our review of historical information do not indicate that this was an area of DoD impact. That's why we picked that…we actually picked it as a background location. [School will follow-up]
[Henderson] Do you have any idea what would cause that elevation?	**Staigerwald:** It's speculation...but I know that in various sites we've been to, we've seen some you know, shot…like lead shot. So like some of these areas have been used for hunting…that doesn't necessarily mean that it happened recently…it could have been something that happened thirty (30) years ago. It could have been due to the use of lead based paint. Again, it's speculation but it's a…I mean it's a could be.
Mr. Gary Smith, Modern Corporation Q: Yeah, same question as Tim's, do you go back and re-sample these areas where you have an anomaly like this? And like go through your sample or do some other criteria that eliminate some of the obvious? You know…	**Staigerwald:** Based…to verify if it really is there… Yes, we verify and we do Quality Assurance (QA)/Quality Control (QC) on samples to make sure they are accurate.
[Smith] Yes, and like how wide spread it is. You know I've seen where samples were pulled and you have high lead and they do a filter sample...they find out it's actually somebody's old battery casing or something…you eliminate…that it has a large impact.	**Staigerwald:** Right, and what we typically…actually that what the Phase II, more comprehensive investigation did…was went back to the areas of the initial investigation and set up a grid around those and sampled from grided locations to delineate what we found. We did not do this here, this was a spot location to grab a sample, surface and sub-surface, for statistical derivation of background locations.
[Smith] Is it leachable or total lead?	**Staigerwald:** It was total lead…it was not a TCLP…you were probably thinking about TCLP, yeah…it was total lead.
[Smith] What's the natural RAD background in this area?	**Staigerwald:** Actually Judy could probably answer that more accurately than I could… Dr. Judith **Leithner**, Niagara Falls Storage Site Project Manager, USACOE: Usually it's 12,000 counts per minute…just average.

Mr. Martin Hodgins: Q: Is there an average for lets say, the Great Lakes versus the central Midwest? I'm just curious...I mean they did a lot of blasting in Mexico and there's a lot of iodine and all types of poisons going up the midwest in our country. So in the Great Lakes we've got all this other poison…so I'm just curious if you can give me an analogy of what's…	**Leithner:** There probably is Marty but the reason we came up with this. Is we went all over the area and measured it ourselves to make sure that we were more localized because part of the problem we've had…as you know, when we talk about impact of some of the chemicals…is that it's over too wide an area. For instance, if you were to look in a book, it might say this is the average for New York State. And that doesn't really mean much for us…so what we are doing is trying to make sure that is average for this area.
Now would you just…just play on this question, when you say area…for example you did the RAD test here…and how about Linde and how about say Guterl, is this what you 're saying is an average---12000. We could make it a little smaller area, we could say upper west New York.	Actually, what I'm talking about is actual measurement in the site and the land around it where people live around it and so on…
So that's our average site here…RAD of 12000. Thank you.	Right, it also coordinates pretty well with the whole area, but when I quote an actual number. You really want to measure it. And if I were to pull something out of a book and say the whole western New York …it really is.
Ms. Nona McQuay: Q: Question for Ms. Staigerwald. You mentioned elevated samplings of phenols and ph thalates...are they above what you would have expected to find?	**Staigerwald:** [repeated question on microphone] No, it's not something that is naturally occurring...so, typically that would be from some process. So, it…in areas that we looked at anyway we attributed to some DoD activities.
On the CWM property you report elevated metals—could you define metals…in other words was arsenic found there?	Yes, the metals that were included in the target analyte list. And that included, I may miss one or two here…but we can of course get you a full list… as a response to a question. They included aluminum, arsenic, cadmium, chromium, lead, barium, thorillium…I'm sure I'm missing…iron, calcium, …a lot of the nutrients like calcium, potassium, that type of metal. Thallium, vanadium, zinc, silver, selenium, and excuse me for not going in alphabetical order. That's most of them, there's probably one or two that I'm missing as well as boron and lithium.
Mr. Charles Lamb: Q: On several of the slides you said that the residue of chemicals or metals exceeded criteria. And for some of us who aren't trained scientist we aren't sure, at least I'm not…how dangerous this is or not. Now several times you said…you've found elevated levels this may lead to "possible" risk assessment. And my question would be, why possible risk assessment? I would think what we would want to have would be a risk assessment for every exceedance of the criteria. And to know how dangerous this is.	**Staigerwald:** [repeated question on microphone] Some of the criteria that we used were not health based criteria. Typically when you screen the concentrations in order to evaluate whether to go into a risk assessment you screen against health regulatory levels. For metals we actually used NY guidance which suggested you compare to background rather than health based values. So a lot of those metals you see are coming up as exceedences but they may not be carried through a risk assessment because they do not exceed health based regulatory criteria.
Ms. Jennifer Rhue: Q: I got a question that Tom wanted me to ask. I'm not sure if this appropriate	**Staigerwald:** Basically the answer to that question would basically be deferred to the health

but on the #3 school, have you obtained a list of pupils for a follow-up on the health problems that they might have had when they attended there. [some discussion from audience on which building #3 school was…unresolved…no answer from anyone on which building is #3]	department. But that's not something the Corps of Engineers would do…they don't do health studies.
Mr. Jim Weld: Q: I had a further question of slide #18 section showing the soil profile. You show Lake Ontario there as zero elevation. I assume that's just for this schematic…zero elevation is the ground from where you're starting from. Also, there's a number there next to silt and clay …1.32 inches per year. Is that a rate for… So it's obvious when it hits the blue area there's silt and sand that's going to move faster.	**Staigerwald:** Right. These are just basically cartoons that kind of represent generally what's going on at the site. That is a rate at which if…if…ground water is present, which in a lot of our borings that we did…we didn't find anything that would indicate ground water was actually there. But if it were present, and it is in some areas, that's about the rate at which it would travel at. Correct. If it gets to that. Now the good thing about this site is that it needs to go through that clay in order to get there. And the data would indicate from samples of the clay and study of the clay…that clay would basically prohibit the migration down into that silt/sand area.

Site Update – Corps of Engineers provided an update of activities associated with the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) at the Niagara Falls Storage Site.

Questions and Answers from Restoration Advisory Board Members and Members of the Public Regarding the Niagara Falls Storage Site

COMMENT	RESPONSE
Unidentified RAB Member: Q: When do you expect the gamma walk-over data in?	**Dr. Judith Leithner**, Niagara Falls Storage Site Project Manager, USACOE: Actually, I have a lot of it now, I just didn't have the time to present it tonight. I have everything that's been done here, I've at least seen the downloads. And what I have to do and I hope I'm a lot luckier than I was tonight…what I have to do is to put these on slides that are meaningful. Because right now what it shows is colored coded areas and it needs a little bit of work so that when I show it in a public forum…it means something. Because all you'll get is like…let's say a green spot…well alright that means the green spot is clean, but it doesn't tell you…alright for the gamma walkover, you know it's below 12,000…let's put it this way, it doesn't exceed 12,000 but you don't know what it is…probably 12,000 since that's background. But if I were to put an exceedance there, then I would be able to put on the table or on the chart, well this is like 15,000…I mean something that would be meaningful. Because if I show these to you right now…what's she doing? It's boring.
Have they found the car body? [refers to an unsubstantiated report of an old car body buried on the site]	Not yet. I don't know if it's rumor or fact. But not yet. But they haven't done the rear of the property…that's what they are doing the site clearing for. So… Buried car.
Unidentified man: Did you find any other anomalies that you are going to do any further investigation on?	**Leithner:** [repeated question on microphone] So far the anomalies that we've found from the geophysical…are some things we knew were there like some drums in the south. So far, we haven't found anything very different but where we are expecting to find those things is on the rear of the property. Because actually the DOE fairly well characterized, in terms of what was buried. This clean area of the site—it's the back part of the site that was not characterized at all and that's why we are having to go cut this brush, they didn't…in fact it's worse than that…we are having to take down trees and brush and everything else to get in there. And a lot of the people who are working out there

	are not pleased with me because it's full of snakes and things.
Ms. Nona McQuay: Q: For the next quarterly meeting would you think there would be some meaningful data ready?	**Leithner:** I will have a lot of it…I think what you're maybe going to want to see though is for me to do it in some segments like some one meeting and some another meeting. Because I'm not actually joking…I have…just for Phase I…10,000 pages of data. And we finished Phase II and we've received that. We are in the process of doing Phase III on the RI and I have a desk full of printouts from the geophysical and everything we've done. I think …if I went through it all in one meeting. I could definitely…could give you an overview but I think you'd be left unsatisfied as to what does this mean and where really is the contamination. So maybe it would make sense and we'll probably talk about this back at the office to do geophysical one night and to do radiological one night and then to do an overview of data showing…okay this is where we are going to target…say our trenching. So it would give you a good idea but in enough detail where I could give you something meaningful. What you might want to know, is, as you know, the feasibility study follows on this and can tell us the feasibility of different technologies for cleaning up the site. I've already sent just the scope of work for that, matter of fact I gave it to Kent tonight. It's on its last review through the regulatory agencies and once that happens we negotiate the contract and begin looking at technologies. Now it seems strange why that when you don't quite have your data done can you start this. Well, it's an iterative process, so they get some things in place. And as we learn more they go back and that way you get the best feasibility study and best the options as for clean-up.
Mr. Gary Smith, Modern Corporation: Q: I just had a question about your gamma survey. I assume that most of that was off the landfill proper. And I guess, a follow-up to that is… how often do you actually go through and do a gamma survey on the land proper to check the integrity of the cap? Yes.	**Leithner:** Okay, that was sort of a dual part question. And I believe you asked if…did the gamma survey off the cap as well as on. Was that your question? And the second one was how often do we do surveys of the cap to make sure that's secure? Are those the questions? The first one…yes the gamma survey we are doing is off the cap as well as on. It's the entire property. And actually there's a couple of classes of survey that you do. This is kind of getting complex but I'll try and conserve your time and still tell you. A Class I means you knew that at some point in time that they handled radiological material on that area. And so you are doing a very very close survey…you almost miss nothing. A Class II means you have no evidence that someone used radiological materials there, but you don't trust 'em. So you are going to go back out and you are going to do a little wider space survey and you are going

	to say, do I find anything. If the answer is no, then you still leave that as a Class II at this point. If the answer is yes, you convert it into a Class I and you go back and do a very detailed survey of that. So that's the answer to your first question. The answer to your second question is…we're all the time monitoring to make sure that that cell is secure. There is a number of things we do…we have detectors at the limit of the property that determine whether radon is being emitted. We have detectors all over the cap that we check periodically and make sure that the radon readings are safe levels, which indeed they are. We do ground water measurement…both in the upper and lower…I'll call them water bearing zones, they aren't really aquifers. We are always testing those for anything…any parameter that we would test in that cell…we test in the water to make sure none is coming out. And so, we call it our surveillance plan and you can access that on our website. It gives you all the detailed information for everything we've taken over the past year. And usually we have some past years on there so you can see whether anything is changing.
Mr. Timothy **Henderson**, Residents Organized for Lewiston-Porter's Environment (ROLE) Q: Dr. Leithner, in 1980 the gamma levels of the Rochester Burial ground were 20 milli-rankins per hour. How does that compare to background? Okay. I mean…to a percentage, I mean is it 10 times or…I'm not a scientist…	**Leithner:** It's above it and we will be checking it…that's part of our survey to see whether there's still radiological material there. I've got almost the same problem you have, I'm not working in those units…if you're used to working in those units. What I've got to do is go back and convert them to units that I'm used to and I can give you an answer to that. But right now to say how much percent beyond…I almost don't ever deal in those. One more question I understand from the RAB. That concludes the RAB questions.

Rochester Burial Update – NYSDEC provided an update of research information associated with the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) at the Niagara Falls Storage Site.

Questions and Answers from Restoration Advisory Board Members Regarding the NYSDEC Presentation

COMMENT	RESPONSE
Mr. Martin Hodgins: Q: Now that you think you've located…sounds like…according to those documents…when is the soonest that you think they'll be doing some testing as far as drill testing or actual excavation with an excavator?	**Mr. Kent Johnson, NYSDEC:** I'll have to defer to Mrs. Judy Leithner about further investigation, Judy. **Dr. Judith Leithner**, Niagara Falls Storage Site Project Manager, USACOE: Mr. Hodgins has just asked now that we've located the area where it is what is the soonest that we would be doing borings or something on the area. This is what we will be doing. We will be doing the geophysical study to see if anything is down there. If there is something down there we'll trench around it…we will trench down to see exactly what it is and take samples. If nothing shows up, but it looks like the soil has been disturbed…like it looks like there has been fill put in there. We'll bore down and take some cores and analyze the cores but we won't dig in. If see nothing, then we are going to say "no further action."
Ms. Rebecca Zayatz: Q: Judy did you say when? So that is this year?	**Leithner:** When? We are going to have to be talking to you about that. It looks like we are going to have to clear some before we can do the geophysical. So I will be calling you relative to what's feasible to clear and when. That is this year unless it gets in your way because we actually have awarded the modification to do that study. We just have to make sure that it's within your timetable as well. Okay and what do I have to do to get approval for clearing from you? Just call you. Okay that's imminent…within the next 2 months.

TOSC Questions and Answers from Restoration Advisory Board Members

COMMENT	RESPONSE
Unidentified RAB member: Q: How about lay terms? What are we talking about there? Does the funding come from the taxpayers…does the funding come from the Army Corps of Engineers…is there a budget set aside for the community here to pay an organization like yours to come in to help us…how's that set up in lay terms? United States Government?	**Mr. Librizzi:** The money that we get and the money that we will get through the next round is actually Superfund money. United States Government. So you don't pay…its no cost to the community at all. You just get the services.
Unidentified RAB member: Q: I have a question. Now would your involvement become…more involved as they go from the investigation to choosing technology, where you would be reviewing the technology choices and advising the community on their appropriateness? No health issues…just talk…	**Mr. Librizzi:** Oh, [repeated question on microphone]. Yes, we do that. We also would look at for example, I think from…my experience, we could be reviewing for you…that big document that's in the public library. And there are a number of issues that came up tonight that you may want independent review, for example, somebody raised the issue about "background." Well you know, the process of how background was determined. Well, hopefully, we would be able to give you a better understanding as to what was done in terms of background…and then give an independent opinion as to whether in fact background was defined…as it was defined. Because in this case, background could be a very significant point for you to be aware of. So those are the kind of things we would look at. And that's what you would get…an evaluation. And we would have somebody, for example, if we did the evaluation, whoever does it would come in and give a report to the RAB and say…I reviewed it. This my observation of the report…this is the major points that we think you should be aware of…that you should be concerned about and these are the pros and cons of those issues. And you take that and start asking the people the kind of questions you want to ask. No, all health too. It's everything, everything. It's health issues as well.
Mr. Steve Yaksich: Q: What part of the process do you come in? Do you come in just when the report is written or do you come in when we are developing the scope of work?	**Mr. Librizzi:** Well, it depends…on where the project is. It depends…like you're at a stage where you have done a good part of the remedial investigation. And reports out there…I don't know if it has been accepted by the community or not. Whether it's open for comment or not either. But, if in fact it was open for comment, we'd come in and review that document. If in fact, we're back in the earlier days, where a scope of work was prepared…to do the field work. Then we would review the scope of work and say…yes, it makes

	sense. They are attacking it appropriately and they're covering all the areas that need to be covered. Or…maybe you want to ask the question of why we're not doing this…or if we did this would get a better response back. And then you would take that and you'd start interacting with the Government within the process that you are going through.
Unidentified RAB member: Q: I think one of the on-going frustrations is that, if I read it right, I think the community's big concern is health. And the Army Corps of Engineers keeps saying that isn't our portfolio. So you could help with that?	**Mr. Librizzi:** Well risk assessment is part of the process. So they have to get involved with it. I mean if they are going to make a risk assessment. **Dr. Judith Leithner**, Niagara Falls Storage Site Project Manager, USACOE: Sir, that's not exactly what they want us to do. **Mr. Librizzi:** They being… **Leithner:** We are doing risk assessments on those properties. What they want us to do is go out and do health surveys to see… **Mr. Librizzi:** Oh, epidemiological… **Leithner:** Yes, we aren't set up to do that. We don't have the experts to do it. And we've told people who to contact to get it done because yes, we agree it should be done. We just can't do it. **Mr. Librizzi:** Okay, now that I better understand it. We do not generate our own data, we provide advice…so we will not be capable of doing epidemiology studies. We would never have the money to do that because "epi" studies are very expensive. So we will not generate data…like for example he said why don't you go out and grab some samples? We can't do that. Because that's money…that's very expensive to do those things and we don't have that kind of funding.
Unidentified RAB member: Q: We're of…actually a non-advisory advisory board. Yep, and I was wondering… Yeah, …at the end of the process, when the process is over, do you make a recommendation? …to make sure we touch all bases?	**Mr. Librizzi:** You're a non-advisory board? Restoration advisory board? We generally do not make recommendations…because we attempt to not be part of the process. We attempt to provide the tools for you so you are in the process. We attempt to do that…absolutely. By the way, that's a thin line that you have to walk. I'm sitting down with you reviewing your report…it's a very thin line to recommend…don't recommend.
Unidentified RAB member: Q: It would seem to	**Mr. Librizzi:** That's what TOSC is for.

me that we could use this kind of assistance here because questions come up all the time. And although we are an advisory board, we have different backgrounds and skills…and certainly most of don't have the kind of thing that we would like to have…so that we would have more…let's say an expert's opinion also on what we're hearing. And I think that's the kind of role you could give us so we could feel more confident that we are understanding and able to communicate to the community…what we are finding out.	I think that would be helpful.
Mr. Mike Basile: Statement: I would just like to speak on behalf of EPA, and as Mr. Librizzi has indicated, the Environmental Protection Agency has used Mr. Librizzi's services with the New Jersey Institute of Technology. And I have the responsibility for 28 SuperFund sites that are on the National Priority List in western and central New York. And many of these sites at the present time, are under the New Jersey Institute of Technology's assistance and locally…the University of Buffalo are participating in providing that technical assistance to communities. Where we, as an agency, are providing community involvement…and I can tell you that we are very pleased…as well as the community is very pleased. Because they are getting another opinion and it's not a Government opinion. And it's a very technical and educated opinion from some very highly trained individuals.	
Ms. Nona McQuay: Q: And that leads to my question, I understand that you would contract out services to primarily people from universities…is that right? What kind of personnel would you be looking for…would you be looking for toxicologists, radiation physicists, what type do you tend to hire for this?	**Mr. Librizzi:** Yes. Well, it depends upon what…[repeated question on microphone]…it'll be based upon the needs of the community. For example, we're working with a community in New York State where they specifically wanted a toxicologist. Because of the issues they were dealing with. So we got a toxicologist to deal with that. We worked with another community where they particularly interested with ground water. So we wanted to make sure we had a hydrogeologist…with experience in hydrogeology. We had communities who were interested in remediation technologies. We made sure we had an expert who knew the suite of technologies that were generally available…including innovative approaches to be part of the project. So it's very much based upon the needs of the community and the situation in which they are in. And I'll point out that you have veto power on who I tell you or who I recommend. If you look at somebody and say I don't like this guy…he doesn't make any sense to me. And then

	we would get something else…get somebody else.
Ms. Arleen Kreusch: Q: I have one quick question. Would you work with the entire RAB separately or in separate meetings from these meetings or would you work with small committees from the RAB?	**Mr. Librizzi:** Well, how do we work with the community? That'll be based upon how the community would like it. I mean it would seem to me that we would want to work with everybody. I like to work with a smaller group. But I personally think that you are my clients, if I might put it that way. And I would work with you as a group. Of course there would be a point of contact who we would generally interface with but the reviewer reports and that should report directly back to the RAB. Now just let me get a point of clarification in my mind. As I pointed out, I think you need to think about whether you want to participate…you need to work out what kinds of support that you want us to give you because it's important for me to understand what you want so that I can get you the right people. Alright? So, what I think you want, in terms of just what I am hearing is want somebody strictly to provide some technical assistance. Review of documents and give you some advice as to what those documents are. Throughout the process…the investigation phase and the remedy decision phase. Is that kind of…is it at least that? And we are talking about RAD and Hazardous substances issues. And you see there's an educational component as well…I'm just curious as to whether in fact, we should be doing some educational component as well.
Mr. Steve Yaksich: Q: How would you normally proceed from here?	**Mr. Librizzi:** I would suggest the co-chair send a letter to me.
Unidentified RAB member: Q: Send a letter to …but he would first have to have some concurrence of the…	**Mr. Librizzi:** Yes, you folks have to decide, yes…
Discussion: RAB members discussed whether to request the services of Mr. Librizzi.	
Ms. Arleen Kreusch: Statement: First let me say that I reviewed the rules in the guidance that was part of the meeting minutes from the last meeting. We are to pursue the Technical Outreach Services to Communities (TOSC) option before we go anywhere else. We need to decide whether you want to use that or you want us to look further. That is a decision you have to make. So, I guess I'm going to ask again, if you would like to go and pursue other options or if you would like to go with the Technical Outreach Services to Communities (TOSC).	
Unidentified RAB member: Q: What other options do you have?	
Ms. Arleen Kreusch: Statement: The other option is that there is a mechanism in the Corps guidance for technical assistance that is called TAP. And we would have to fund a consultant, so to speak, for you.	

Unidentified RAB member: Would it be possible for the co-chair and maybe one or two other people from this committee to meet with you and come up with something much more specific on exactly what we do want to ask from you. And then have a very specific proposal for the next meeting…and we can vote "yes" or "no" on. I think this larger…	**Mr. Librizzi:** Absolutely, we can do that by telephone. I have a summary of all of the projects that we are working on. You can make your own decision.
Ms. Arleen Kreusch: Q: Do I have volunteers to kind of be on a subcommittee to investigate the TOSC program? Mr. Angus, Mr. Langlois, Mr. Passanese, Mr. Smith…please add Nils Olsen [volunteered for the TOSC subcommittee] Who will report back to the next meeting? Do you want discuss that first among yourselves and then I can arrange a telephone conference between all of you. Would you like something like that?	**Mr. Langlois RAB Member:** I'll contact all of the subcommittee members and report at our next meeting.

Questions and Answers from Members of the Public

David Cooper: I'm a Lewiston resident and am on several local commissions. I may not have been prepared for Mr. Librizzi's presentation and I may not understand it. I would want you to know that. It would seem to me that the expert opinions to be engaged by the New Jersey Institute of Technology must be presented by and filtered…and interpreted for the Restoration Advisory Board…by the NJIT representative. Why can't the board get the opinions of experts directly…without the intervention of the NJIT representatives? Is this adding another layer, not required? Does this need further investigation before adopting? Alternatives need to be explored. **Mr. Steve Yaksich:** Statement: The board could have someone they select, the person whether from the UB or another local college…Mr. Librizzi would not be filtering whatever information came through that New Jersey board. That person would be working directly with the RAB…that would be their person…and they would select him. If the person wasn't satisfactory, then you'd find somebody else. That person would not be working for the Corps of Engineers.	The RAB has their subcommittee and they will evaluate Mr. Librizzi's program and if they feel after that evaluation that we need to look further, we will look further.
Mary Ann Rolland: Mr. Syms has left. And he was supposed to have a map. Your slides showed some things and what is going to be done with those findings and what are your proposed remediation steps there? So then, would the Army Corps of Engineers start cleaning those sites up?	**Mary Kay Foley**, LOOW Project Manager, USACOE: We're going to enter the next phase…we're going to enter all these sample results into what we call a Risk Assessment and that's one of the reason why we are going to be showing the Risk Assessment video. So the community will understand exactly what a risk assessment means. Basically the principle of risk assessment is the poison is in the dose. Although the results are above the screening criteria they still may not pose a rsik to humans if humans are not exposed to them. We will be evaluating the exposure to these chemicals by various routes, be it a site worker walking around on site or what have you. At that point, if some of these areas are still showing a risk to human health, then we would start to evaluate what we would need to do to clean up those areas. If DoD caused the contamination, then yes. If DoD didn't cause the contamination, who will clean it up? And basically, it would be whoever caused the contamination.

Next agenda item is to remind RAB members that each should have received a RAB Evaluation questionnaire. Please complete them and return them to me and if you brought yours tonight, I'll be happy to take it. I hope to be able to provide the RAB a summary of the evaluations at the next meeting.

The next item on the agenda is the election of a Community Co-Chair. Nils is not present and was the previous Co-Chair. Anyone know whether he is interested in running again or not. Nomination was made to re-nominate Dr. Nils Olsen as Co-Chair. Are there any other nominations? None. If there are no other nominations, then Dr. Nils Olsen is thereby re-elected as the Community Co-Chair of the RAB.

Action Items:

- The Corps data…was closed out.
- The technical assistance program, we will be looking at that and report from the subcommittee at the next meeting.
- The building…Mary Kay said the report would be ready this summer and we could do a small presentation on that at the next meeting.
- The interviews will still be ongoing per Dr. Leithner.
- University of Rochester may have information available…they continue their data search.
- NFSS presentation at next meeting.
- Mr. Paul Dickey will stay on as an action item, as far as health studies.
- Tim Henderson provided documents and the Corps will copy and return them.

Agenda Items for the Next meeting:

- Will follow the same agenda format.
- RAB survey evaluation summaries will be distributed to RAB members at next meeting.
- Corps update on NFSS—a presentation from Dr. Leithner.
- Request from RAB members to e-mail Building action item needs to the DERP-FUDS e-mail…DERPFUDS@usace.army.mil.
- Report from the subcommittee on the Technical Outreach support for Communities (TOSC).
- Summary of the RAB evaluation forms.
- Video to be shown on Risk Assessment (prepared by EPA)—two showings…before and after the meeting. Start at 6:00 p.m. and then at the conclusion of the meeting.

Next meeting scheduled for October 17, 2001.

Due to time constraints, some members of the audience weren't able to have their questions addressed by the Corps of Engineers. Their comments, submitted on the forms provided by the Corps, along with responses from Mary Kay Foley and Judy Leithner, are outlined below.

COMMENT	RESPONSE
Ms. Michelle Rehmann: Q: In relations to the RI presentation for DERP-FUDS for LOOW…was TNT found in any samples collected near NFSS?	**Dr. Judith Leithner**, Niagara Falls Storage Site Project Manager, USACOE: None found from NFSS work. **Mary Kay Foley**, LOOW Project Manager, USACOE: The TNT pipeline runs around 2000' north of the NFSS boundary.
Q: Were any other organic compounds found in these samples?	**Dr. Judith Leithner**, Niagara Falls Storage Site Project Manager, USACOE: Organics were found on NFSS, but I believe the question is asking about organics for samples containing TNT and its degradation products. We have no samples containing TNT and its degradation products. **Mary Kay Foley**, LOOW Project Manager, USACOE: No organic compounds found in the TNT line.
Q: When will a copy of the data report from RI be available?	**Dr. Judith Leithner**, Niagara Falls Storage Site Project Manager, USACOE: The RI report for NFSS will likely be available mid 2002. **Mary Kay Foley**, LOOW Project Manager, USACOE: The Phase I RI report has been available for 2 years, Phase II is currently in draft form and will be available in a few months.
Mr. Ronald Kuis: Q: Sandy Staigerwald presented four (4) slides of sampling results for the Somerset Group property. I would like to have full size (8 ½"x11") copies of the four slides because the handouts are reduced in size and very hard to read. Please mail to me.	**Mary Kay Foley**, LOOW Project Manager, USACOE: Provided via US Mail on June 21, 2001.
Mr. Tim Henderson: Q: LOOW site is on a flood plane…does that impact on core [Corps] criteria?	**Dr. Judith Leithner**, Niagara Falls Storage Site Project Manager, USACOE: The rear part of the NFSS has wetlands associated with it, i.e. in the panhandle part of the property at the extreme north. For a 24 hour 100 year storm (i.e. hard rains for 24 hours, happens approximately once in 100 years), the wetlands will swell and the north of the property will become quite wet, but will not approach the waste containment structure (WCS) or the buffer zone around it. Ditches will fill with water and may overtop, but again will not impact the WCS or buffer zone because of its elevated, sloped design.

Guests Present:	**Affiliation:**
Kim Patterson	Self
William Kowalski	Self
Gordy Porter	EA Engineering
Bill Michelmore	Buffalo News
Chuck Basham	USACE
Brenda Herman	EA Engineering
Bill Kowalewski	USACE
James Bynum	USACE
Jennifer Rhue for Thomas Freck	Self
Mary J. Lavender	Self
Joseph B. Baker, Jr.	USACE
Steve Mikolaichik	Self
Roberta Mikolaichik	Self
Dennis Rimer	Self
Katherine Konshein	Self
Joe Foley	Self
Arleen Kreusch	USACE, CT
Nick Morreale	ENSOL
Michele L. Hope	USACE
Alexander W. Kravitz	Self
Colleen Wendel	Self
Judy Leithner	USACE
Mary Kay Foley	USACE
Ronald Kuis	Somerset Group
Sharon Miller	Self
Marn A. Weld	Self
Irene Murawski	Self
Jim Leighton	Lew-Port
Lorraine Miller	Self
Tom Leithner	Self
Bill Monteith	Self
Karen Keil	USACE
Steve Bousquet	Self
Charles Bartha	Self
Roger Flick	Self
William Librizzi	NJIT
Sandra Staigerwald	EA Engineering
Fr. Peter M. Calabrese	Self
Louis Ricciuti	FACTS
Patricia K. Townsend	Society of Applied Anthro
Tom Switala	USACE
Michelle Rehmann	IUC
Joan Broderick	Self
Mary Ann Rolland	Town of Porter Brownfields
James Darnall	IT Corp
David Cooper	Lewiston Envir Commission
Rick Lee	Congressman LaFalce